

Some topics concerning the theory of singular dynamical systems

Narciso Román-Roy*

Departamento de Matemática Aplicada IV.

Ed. C-3, Campus Norte UPC. C/ Jordi Girona 1. 08034 Barcelona. Spain

Abstract

Some subjects related to the geometric theory of singular dynamical systems are reviewed in this paper. In particular, the following two matters are considered: the theory of canonical transformations for presymplectic Hamiltonian systems, and the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian constraint algorithms and the time-evolution operator.

Key words: *Presymplectic manifolds, singular systems, canonical transformations, Lagrangian formalism, Hamiltonian formalism.*

AMS s. c. (2000): 37J05, 53D05, 53D22, 70H03, 70H05, 70H15, 70H45.

PACS (1999): 02.40.Hw, 11.10.Ef, 45.20.Jj

1 Introduction

The aim of this paper is to carry out a brief review of several topics concerning the theory of autonomous singular dynamical systems, from a geometrical perspective. In particular, our interest will be focused on two subjects, namely: the theory of canonical transformations for singular systems, and the problem of the compatibility of the dynamical equations of Lagrangian and

*e-mail: nrr@ma4.upc.edu

Hamiltonian singular systems; more precisely, the analysis of the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian constraint algorithms and their relation.

The article is based on the developments made on the references [18] and [7], for the theory of canonical transformations, and [1], [12], [13], [32], [10] and [23] for aspects related with the constraint algorithms. Thus, we will refer to these articles for more details on all these results.

All manifolds are real and C^∞ . All maps are C^∞ . Sum over crossed repeated indices is understood. Throughout this paper $i(X)\omega$ denotes the contraction between the vector field X and the differential form ω , and $L(X)\omega$ the Lie derivative of ω with respect to the vector field X .

2 Canonical transformations

2.1 Presymplectic Locally Hamiltonian Systems

Definition 1 *A presymplectic locally Hamiltonian system (p.l.h.s.) is a triad (M, ω, α) , where (M, ω) is a presymplectic manifold, and $\alpha \in Z^1(M)$ (i.e., it is a closed 1-form), which is called a Hamiltonian form.*

A p.l.h.s has associated the following equation

$$i(X)\omega = \alpha \quad , \quad X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$$

If X exists, it is called a *presymplectic locally Hamiltonian vector field* associated to α . Nevertheless, in the best cases, this equation has consistent solutions only in a submanifold $j_C: C \hookrightarrow M$, where there exist $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, tangent to C , such that

$$[i(X)\omega - \alpha]|_C = 0 \tag{1}$$

Furthermore, the solution X is not unique, in general, and this non-uniqueness is known as *gauge freedom*. In general $(C, \omega_C = j_C^*\omega)$ is a presymplectic manifold which is called the *final constraint submanifold* (f.c.s.).

The following theorem gives the local structure of p.l.h.s. (see [7]):

Theorem 1 *Let (M, ω, α) be a p.l.h.s., and $j_C: C \hookrightarrow M$ the f.c.s. Then:*

1. There are a symplectic manifold (P, Ω) and a coisotropic embedding $\iota_C : C \hookrightarrow P$ such that $\omega_C = \iota_C^* \Omega$.

2. For every $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, tangent to C , solution to (1), there exists a family of vector fields $\mathfrak{X}(P, C) \subset \mathfrak{X}(P)$ such that, for every $X_\xi \in \mathfrak{X}(P, C)$, (a) X_ξ are tangent to C , (b) $X_\xi|_C = X|_C$, and (c) X_ξ are solutions to the equations $i(X_\xi)\Omega = \alpha_P + \xi$, where $\alpha_P \in Z^1(P)$ satisfies $\iota_C^* \alpha_P = j_C^* \alpha$, and $\xi \in Z^1(P)$ is any first-class constraint form (i.e., $\iota_C^* \xi = 0$, and the Hamiltonian vector field associated with ξ , $X_\xi \in \mathfrak{X}(P)$, is tangent to C).

3. The coisotropic embedding ι_C and the family $\mathfrak{X}(P, C)$ are unique, up to an equivalence relation of local symplectomorphisms reducing to the identity on C .

(P, C, Ω) is the coisotropic canonical system associated to (M, ω, α) .

2.2 Canonical Transformations for p.l.h.s.

Let $\mathfrak{X}_{lh}(C)$ be the set of locally Hamiltonian vector fields in (C, ω_C) ; that is, $\mathfrak{X}_{lh}(C) = \{X_C \in \mathfrak{X}(C) \mid L(X_C)\omega_C = 0\}$.

Definition 2 Let $(M_i, \omega_i, \alpha_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$) be a p.l.h.s., with f.c.s. $j_{C_i} : C_i \rightarrow M_i$, and $\omega_{C_i} = j_{C_i}^* \omega_i$, such that $\dim M_1 = \dim M_2$, $\dim C_1 = \dim C_2$, and $\text{rank } \omega_{C_1} = \text{rank } \omega_{C_2}$. A canonical transformation between these systems is a pair (Φ, ϕ) , with $\Phi \in \text{Diff}(M_1, M_2)$ and $\phi \in \text{Diff}(C_1, C_2)$, such that:

1. $\Phi \circ j_{C_1} = j_{C_2} \circ \phi$; that is, we have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M_1 & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & M_2 \\ \uparrow j_{C_1} & & \uparrow j_{C_2} \\ C_1 & \xrightarrow{\phi} & C_2 \end{array}$$

2. $\phi_*(\mathfrak{X}_{lh}(C_1)) \subset \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(C_2)$.

The generalization of Lee Hwa Chung's theorem to presymplectic manifolds allows us to prove that (see [18]):

Proposition 1 Condition 2 is equivalent to saying that there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $j_{C_1}^*(\Phi^* \omega_2 - c \omega_1) = \phi^* \omega_{C_2} - c \omega_{C_1} = 0$.

c is called the *valence* of the canonical transformation. So, *univalent canonical transformations* are the *presymplectomorfisms* between C_1 and C_2 .

Let (P_i, C_i, Ω_i) be the coisotropic canonical systems associated with the p.l.h.s $(M_i, \omega_i, \alpha_i)$, $i = 1, 2$. The class of ϕ is defined by $\{\phi\} = \{\Psi \in \text{Diff}(P_1, P_2) \mid \Psi \circ \iota_{C_1} = \iota_{C_2} \circ \phi\}$. So we have the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 P_1 & & \xrightarrow{\Psi} & & P_2 \\
 & \nearrow \iota_{C_1} & & \nwarrow \iota_{C_2} & \\
 & M_1 & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & M_2 & \\
 & \uparrow J_{C_1} & & \uparrow J_{C_2} & \\
 & C_1 & \xrightarrow{\phi} & C_2 &
 \end{array}$$

And therefore we have (see [7]):

Theorem 2 *There exists $\psi \in \{\phi\}$ which is a symplectomorphism between the symplectic manifolds (P_1, Ω_1) and (P_2, Ω_2) .*

As a particular situation, we can analyze the canonical transformations in a p.l.h.s. Thus, let (M, ω, α) be a p.l.h.s., with f.c.s. $J_C: C \hookrightarrow M$. Consider the involutive distribution $\ker \omega_C$ in C , and assume that the quotient space $\hat{C} = C / \ker \omega_C$ is a manifold with natural projection $\hat{\pi}: C \rightarrow \hat{C}$ (it is called the *reduced phase space* associated to the p.l.h.s.). Then the form ω_C is $\hat{\pi}$ -projectable; hence there exists $\hat{\Omega} \in \Omega^2(\hat{C})$ such that $\omega_C = \hat{\pi}^* \hat{\Omega}$. Furthermore, $(\hat{C}, \hat{\Omega})$ is a symplectic manifold, and we have the following result (see [7]):

Proposition 2 *Every canonical transformation (Φ, ϕ) in (M, ω, α) leaves the distribution $\ker \omega_C$ invariant. As a consequence, there exists a unique $\hat{\phi} \in \text{Diff}(\hat{C})$ such that:*

1. $\hat{\phi} \circ \hat{\pi} = \hat{\pi} \circ \phi$.
2. $\hat{\phi}$ is a symplectomorphism.

Some applications of the geometric theory of p.l.h.s. and their canonical transformations are the following: the study of canonical transformations for regular autonomous systems (it includes a new geometrical description of these kinds of systems based on the *coisotropic embedding theorem*) [8], the analysis of the geometric structure and construction of canonical transformations for the free relativistic massive particle [8], the discussion about

time scaling transformations in Hamiltonian dynamics and their application to celestial mechanics [9], and the construction of realizations of symmetry groups for singular systems and, as an example, the Poincaré realizations for the free relativistic particle [35].

3 Constraints and the Evolution Operator

3.1 Lagrangian Dynamical Systems

(See [3] for details).

Let Q be a n -dimensional differential manifold which constitutes the *configuration space* of a dynamical system. Its tangent and cotangent bundles, $\tau_Q: TQ \rightarrow Q$ and $\pi_Q: T^*Q \rightarrow Q$, are the (*phase spaces of velocities and momenta*) of the system.

A *Lagrangian dynamical system* is a couple (TQ, \mathcal{L}) , where $\mathcal{L} \in C^\infty(TQ)$ is the *Lagrangian function* of the system. Using the canonical elements of TQ , the vertical endomorphism $\mathcal{S} \in \mathfrak{T}_1^1(TQ)$ and the Liouville vector field $\Delta \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$, we can define the *Lagrangian 2-form* $\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = -d(d\mathcal{L} \circ \mathcal{S})$, and the *Lagrangian energy function* $E_{\mathcal{L}} = \Delta(\mathcal{L}) - \mathcal{L}$. Moreover, we define the *Legendre transformation* associated with \mathcal{L} , $\mathcal{FL}: TQ \rightarrow T^*Q$, as the fiber derivative of the Lagrangian.

\mathcal{L} is a *singular Lagrangian* if $\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a presymplectic form (which is assumed to have constant rank) or, what is equivalent, \mathcal{FL} is no longer a local diffeomorphism. In particular, \mathcal{L} is an *almost-regular Lagrangian* if: (i) $M_0 = \mathcal{FL}(TQ)$ is a closed submanifold of T^*Q , (ii) \mathcal{FL} is a submersion onto M_0 , and (iii) for every $p \in TQ$, the fibres $\mathcal{FL}^{-1}(\mathcal{FL}(p))$ are connected submanifolds of TQ . Then (TQ, \mathcal{L}) is an *almost-regular Lagrangian system*.

For almost-regular Lagrangian systems, $(TQ, \Omega_{\mathcal{L}}, dE_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a p.l.h.s., and we have the so-called *Lagrangian dynamical equation*

$$i(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}})\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = dE_{\mathcal{L}} \quad (2)$$

Variational considerations lead us to impose that, solutions $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$ to (2) must be *second-order differential equations* (SODE); that is, holonomic vector fields in TQ . Geometrically this means that

$$\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}) = \Delta \quad (3)$$

For singular Lagrangians this does not hold in general, and (3) must be imposed as an additional condition (*SODE-condition*). Integral curves of vector fields satisfying (2) and (3) are solutions to the Euler-Lagrange equations.

The *Lagrangian problem* consists in finding a submanifold $j_{S_f} : S_f \hookrightarrow TQ$, and $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$, tangent to S_f , such that

$$[i(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}})\omega_{\mathcal{L}} - dE_{\mathcal{L}}]|_{S_f} = 0 \quad , \quad [\mathcal{S}(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}}) - \Delta]|_{S_f} = 0$$

Now, if $\mathcal{FL}_0 : TQ \rightarrow M_0$ is the restriction of \mathcal{FL} to M_0 , we have that $\omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ and $E_{\mathcal{L}}$ are \mathcal{FL}_0 -projectable: there exist $\omega_0 \in \Omega^2(M_0)$, and $h_0 \in C^\infty(M_0)$ such that $\omega_{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{FL}_0^*\omega_0$, $E_{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{FL}_0^*h_0$. Then, (M_0, ω_0, dh_0) is a p.l.h.s. which is called the *canonical Hamiltonian system* associated with the Lagrangian system $(TQ, \omega_{\mathcal{L}}, dE_{\mathcal{L}})$. So we have the *Hamiltonian dynamical equation*

$$i(X_0)\omega_0 = dh_0 \quad ; \quad X_0 \in \mathfrak{X}(M_0)$$

and the *Hamiltonian problem* consists in finding a submanifold $j_{M_f} : M_f \hookrightarrow M_0$ and $X_0 \in \mathfrak{X}(M_0)$ tangent to M_f such that

$$[i(X_0)\omega_0 - dh_0]|_{M_f} = 0$$

3.2 Constraint Algorithms

In order to solve the Hamiltonian problem stated for an almost-regular system different kinds of Hamiltonian constraint algorithms were developed. The first was the local-coordinate *Dirac constraint algorithm* [16], but there were also geometric algorithms: the *Presymplectic Constraint Algorithm* (PCA) of *Gotay, Nester, Hinds* [21], and others by *Marmo, Tulczyjew* et al. [30], [31], etc. All of them give a sequence of submanifolds which, in the best cases, stabilizes giving the f.c.s.: $T^*Q \hookleftarrow M_0 \hookleftarrow M_1 \hookleftarrow \dots \hookleftarrow M_f$.

For the Lagrangian problem, the first attempt was not to consider the SODE-problem (3), and then develop a Lagrangian constraint algorithm by simply applying the P.C.A. to the Lagrangian dynamical equation (2), obtaining a sequence of submanifolds $TQ \hookleftarrow P_1 \hookleftarrow \dots \hookleftarrow P_f$ [19]. The SODE problem is studied later in [20], obtaining a submanifold S_f which solves the lagrangian problem, but which is not defined by constraints and is not maximal. Later, *Kamimura* [28] and *Batlle, Gomis, Pons, Román-Roy* [1] developed local-coordinate Lagrangian constraint algorithms in which the

Lagrangian dynamical equation (2) and the SODE-condition (3) were both considered at the same time. The f.c.s. S_f obtained at the end of the corresponding sequence, $T^*Q \hookleftarrow S_1 \hookleftarrow \dots \hookleftarrow S_f$, is maximal and is defined by constraints. The relation between the aforementioned sequences of submanifolds is explained in the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 TQ & \hookleftarrow & P_1 & \hookleftarrow & \dots & \hookleftarrow & P_f \\
 & & \swarrow & & & & \swarrow \\
 & & S_1 & \hookleftarrow & \dots & \hookleftarrow & S_f
 \end{array} \tag{4}$$

In particular, the submanifolds P_i , $i = 1 \dots f$, are defined by constraints that can be expressed as \mathcal{FL} -projectable functions which give all the Hamiltonian constraints, and are related with the *first-class Hamiltonian constraints*. Furthermore, the submanifolds S_i , $i = 1 \dots f$, are defined by adding constraints that are not \mathcal{FL} -projectable, and they are related with the *second-class Hamiltonian constraints*.

The remaining question was how to describe geometrically the submanifolds S_i and their properties. First, this problem was solved in [12], [13] for S_1 , i.e.; the submanifold of compatibility conditions for (2) and (3), obtaining as the main result that:

Theorem 3 *For every SODE $\Gamma \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ)$, we have:*

$$S_1 = \{p \in TQ \mid [i(Z)(i(\Gamma)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} - dE_{\mathcal{L}})](p) = 0, \forall Z \in \mathcal{M}\}$$

where $\mathcal{M} = \{Z \in \mathfrak{X}(TQ) \mid \mathcal{S}(Z) \in \ker \mathcal{FL}_* = \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}} \cap \mathfrak{X}^{V(\tau_Q)}(TQ)\}$.

In particular, for every $Z \in \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}} \subset \mathcal{M}$, $i(Z)(i(\Gamma)\omega_{\mathcal{L}} - dE_{\mathcal{L}}) = i(Z)(dE_{\mathcal{L}})$ define the submanifold P_1 where (2) is compatible. They are called dynamical constraints, and are related to the existence of primary first-class Hamiltonian constraints.

For every $Z \notin \ker \omega_{\mathcal{L}}$, $Z \in \mathcal{M}$, these functions are called SODE-constraints, and are related to the existence of primary second-class Hamiltonian constraints.

For S_i , $i = 2 \dots f$, the problem was studied in [32], by imposing tangency conditions for solutions to (2) and (3). The main results are the following: there are two kinds of Lagrangian constraints defining every S_i , $i = 1, \dots, f$:

- *Dynamical constraints*, which define the submanifolds P_i , $i = 1, \dots, f$, in the sequence (4). They are related with the solutions to the eq. (2), and

all of them can be expressed as \mathcal{FL} -projectable functions which give all the Hamiltonian constraints.

- SODE (*non-dynamical*) constraints, coming from the SODE-condition (3). They are not \mathcal{FL} -projectable.

Hence, the relation among the sequences of submanifolds in the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms is given in the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & TQ & \longleftrightarrow & P_1 & \longleftrightarrow & \dots \longleftrightarrow P_f \\
 & \nearrow \mathcal{FL} & \downarrow \mathcal{FL}_0 & & \downarrow & \nearrow S_1 & \longleftrightarrow \dots \longleftrightarrow S_f \\
 T^*Q & \longleftrightarrow & M_0 & \longleftrightarrow & M_1 & \longleftrightarrow & \dots \longleftrightarrow M_f
 \end{array}$$

Furthermore, the tangency conditions for dynamical constraints give dynamical and SODE constraints, while the tangency conditions for SODE-constraints remove gauge degrees of freedom and do not give new constraints.

3.3 The Time Evolution Operator K

As a final remark, the complete relation between Hamiltonian and Lagrangian constraints is given by the so-called *time evolution operator* K , which relates Lagrangian and Hamiltonian constraints, and also solutions to the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian problems. (It is also known by the name of the *relative Hamiltonian vector field* [33]). It was introduced and studied for the first time by *J. Gomis* et al. [1], developing some previous ideas of *K. Kamimura* [28]. They give the local-coordinate definition of this operator, whose expression in coordinates is

$$K = v^A \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial q^A} \circ \mathcal{FL} \right) + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q^A} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial p^A} \circ \mathcal{FL} \right)$$

The intrinsic definition and the geometric study of its properties was carried out independently in [10] and [23]. In the first work, K was defined using the *Skinner-Rusk unified formalism* in $TQ \oplus T^*Q$. In the second article, the concept of *section along a map* plays the crucial role, and so we have:

Definition 3 *Let $(TQ, \omega_{\mathcal{L}}, E_{\mathcal{L}})$ be a Lagrangian system, and $\Omega \in \Omega^2(T^*Q)$ the canonical form. The time-evolution operator K associated with $(TQ, \omega_{\mathcal{L}}, E_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a map $K: TQ \longrightarrow TT^*Q$ verifying the following conditions:*

1. (Structural condition): K is vector field along \mathcal{FL} , $\pi_{T^*Q} \circ K = \mathcal{FL}$.
2. (Dynamical condition): $\mathcal{FL}^*[i(K)(\Omega \circ \mathcal{FL})] = dE_{\mathcal{L}}$.
3. (SODE condition): $T\tau_Q \circ K = \text{Id}_{TQ}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 TQ & \xleftarrow{T\tau_Q} & TT^*Q \\
 \text{Id}_{TQ} \downarrow & \nearrow K & \downarrow \pi_{T^*Q} \\
 TQ & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{FL}} & T^*Q
 \end{array}$$

Then, the relation between Lagrangian and Hamiltonian constraints is established as follows (see [1], [10], [23]):

Proposition 3 *If $\xi \in C^\infty(T^*Q)$ is a i th-generation Hamiltonian constraint, then $L(K)\xi$ is a $(i + 1)$ th-generation Lagrangian constraint.*

In particular, if ξ is a first-class constraint (resp. a second-class constraint) for M_f , then $L(K)\xi$ is a dynamical constraint (resp. a SODE constraint).

The time-evolution operator has also been used for studying different kinds of problems concerning singular systems. For instance, the operator K has been extended for analyzing higher-order singular dynamical systems [2], [11], [26], [27]. It is also used for treating constrained systems in general (*linearly singular systems*) [24]. It has been defined and its properties studied for non-autonomous dynamical systems [6]. Finally, K has been applied for analyzing gauge symmetries and other structures for singular systems [22], [25]. Furthermore, sections along maps in general are analyzed and used in different kinds of physical and geometrical problems in [4], [14], [15].

4 Discussion and outlook

Some of the previous problems have been studied in the sphere of first-order classical field theories, specially their *multisymplectic formalism* [5]. So, a geometric constraint algorithm has recently been completed for Lagrangian and Hamiltonian singular field theories [29], and the definition and properties of the operator K have been carried out for field theories [17], [34].

Other potentially interesting topics could be the generalization of some of the above results; such as: to study the local structure of pre-multisymplectic Hamiltonian field theories (previous generalization of the *coisotropic embedding theorem* for premultisymplectic manifolds); the study of canonical transformations for Hamiltonian field theories (*multisymplectomorphisms* and *pre-multisymplectomorphisms*), and the application of the operator K to analyze the relation between Lagrangian and Hamiltonian constraints of singular field theories (which could require prior development of the non-covariant formulation, i.e., *space-time splitting*, of field theories).

Acknowledgments

I acknowledge the financial support of *Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia*, project MTM2004-7832. I am indebted to the organizers of the *International Workshop on Groups, Geometry and Physics* for inviting me to participate on it. I wish also to thank Mr. Jeff Palmer for his assistance in preparing the English version of the manuscript.

References

- [1] C. BATLLE, J. GOMIS, J.M. PONS, N. ROMÁN-ROY: “Equivalence between the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalism for constrained systems”. *J. Math. Phys.* **27** (1986) 2953-2962.
- [2] C. BATLLE, J. GOMIS, J.M. PONS, N. ROMÁN-ROY: “Lagrangian and Hamiltonian constraints for second order singular Lagrangians”. *J. Phys. (A): Math. Gen.* **21**(12) (1988) 2693-2703.
- [3] J.F. CARIÑENA: “Theory of singular Lagrangians”. *Fortschr. Phys.* **38** (1990) 641-679.
- [4] J.F. CARIÑENA: “Section along maps in geometry and physics”, *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Pol. Torino* **54**(3) (1996) 245-256.
- [5] J.F. CARIÑENA, M. CRAMPIN, A. IBORT: “On the multisymplectic formalism for first-order field theories”. *Diff. Geom. Appl.* **1** (1991) 345-374.
- [6] J.F. CARIÑENA, J. FERNÁNDEZ-NÚÑEZ, E. MARTÍNEZ: “Time-dependent K-operator for singular Lagrangians”, (unpublished) (1995).

- [7] J.F. CARINENA, J. GOMIS, L.A. IBORT, N. ROMÁN-ROY: “Canonical transformations theory for presymplectic systems”. *J. Math. Phys.* **26**(8) (1985) 1961-1969.
- [8] J.F. CARINENA, J. GOMIS, L.A. IBORT, N. ROMÁN-ROY: “Applications of the canonical transformations theory for presymplectic systems”. *Nuovo Cim. (B)* **98**(2) (1987) 172-196.
- [9] J.F. CARINENA, L.A. IBORT, E. LACOMBA: “Time scaling as an infinitesimal canonical transformation”. *Celest. Mech.* **42**(1-4) (1987/88) 201-213.
- [10] J.F. CARINENA, C. LÓPEZ: “The time evolution operator for singular Lagrangians”. *Lett. Math. Phys.* **14** (1987) 203-210.
- [11] J.F. CARINENA, C. LÓPEZ: “The time evolution operator for higher-order singular Lagrangians”. *J. Mod. Phys.* **7** (1992) 2447-2468.
- [12] J.F. CARINENA, C. LÓPEZ, N. ROMÁN-ROY: “Geometric study on the connection of Lagrangian and Hamiltonian constraints”. *J. Geom. Phys.* **IV**(3) (1987) 315-334.
- [13] J.F. CARINENA, C. LÓPEZ, N. ROMÁN-ROY: “Origin of Lagrangian constraints and their relation with the Hamiltonian formalism”. *J. Math. Phys.* **29**(5) (1988) 1143-1149.
- [14] J.F. CARINENA, E. MARTÍNEZ, W. SARLET: “Derivations of differential forms along the tangent bundle projection”. *Diff. Geom. and Appl.* **2**(1) (1992) 17-43.
- [15] J.F. CARINENA, E. MARTÍNEZ, W. SARLET: “Derivations of differential forms along the tangent bundle projection II”. *Diff. Geom. and Appl.* **3**(1) (1993) 1-29.
- [16] P.A.M. DIRAC: *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics*. Yeshiva Univ., New York, 1964.
- [17] A. ECHEVERRÍA-ENRÍQUEZ, J. MARÍN-SOLANO, M.C. MUÑOZ-LECANDA, N. ROMÁN-ROY: “On the construction of \mathcal{K} -operators in field theories as sections along Legendre maps”, *Acta Appl. Math.* **77**(1) (2003) 1-40.
- [18] J. GOMIS, J. LLOSA, N. ROMÁN-ROY: “Lee Hwa Chung theorem for presymplectic manifolds. Canonical transformations theory for constrained systems”. *J. Math. Phys.* **25**(5) (1984) 1348-1355.
- [19] M.J. GOTAY, J.M. NESTER: “Presymplectic Lagrangian systems I: the constraint algorithm and the equivalence theorem”. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré A* **30** (1979) 129-142.

- [20] M.J. GOTAY, J.M. NESTER: “Presymplectic Lagrangian systems II: the second order equation problem”. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré A* **32** (1980) 1–13.
- [21] M.J. GOTAY, J.M. NESTER, G. HINDS: “Presymplectic manifolds and Dirac-Bergmann theory of constraints”. *J. Math. Phys.* **27** (1978) 2388–2399.
- [22] X. GRÀCIA, J.M. PONS: “Gauge generators, Dirac conjecture and degrees of freedom for constrained systems”. *Ann. Phys.* **187**(2) (1988) 355–368.
- [23] X. GRÀCIA, J.M. PONS: “On an evolution operator connecting Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms”. *Lett. Math. Phys.* **17** (1989) 175–180.
- [24] X. GRÀCIA, J.M. PONS: “A generalized geometric framework for constrained systems”. *Diff. Geom. Appl.* **2** (1992) 223–247.
- [25] X. GRÀCIA, J.M. PONS: “Singular Lagrangians: some geometric structures along the Legendre map”. *J. Phys. A* **34** (2001) 3047–3070.
- [26] X. GRÀCIA, J.M. PONS, N. ROMÁN-ROY: “Higher order Lagrangian systems: geometric structures, dynamics and constraints”. *J. Math. Phys.* **32** (1991) 2744–2763.
- [27] X. GRÀCIA, J.M. PONS, N. ROMÁN-ROY: “Higher order conds. for singular Lagrangian dynamics”. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **25** (1992) 1989–2004.
- [28] K. KAMIMURA: “Singular Lagrangians and constrained Hamiltonian systems, generalized canonical formalism”. *Nuovo Cim. B* **69** (1982) 33–54.
- [29] M. DE LEÓN, J. MARÍN-SOLANO, J.C. MARRERO, M.C. MUÑOZ-LECANDA, N. ROMÁN-ROY: “Pre-multisymplectic constraint algorithm for field theories”. *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **2**(5) (2005) 1418
- [30] G. MARMO, G. MENDELLA, W.M. TULCZYJEW: “Constrained hamiltonian systems as implicit differential equations”. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **30** (1997) 277–293.
- [31] M.R. MENZIO, W.M. TULCZYJEW: “Infinitesimal symplectic relations and generalized Hamiltonian dynamics”. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré A* **28** (1978) 349–367.
- [32] M.C. MUÑOZ-LECANDA, N. ROMÁN-ROY: “Lagrangian theory for pre-symplectic systems”, *Ann. I. H. Poincaré: Phys. Teor.* **57**(1) (1992) 27–45.
- [33] F. PUGLIESE, A.M. VINOGRADOV: “On the geometry of singular Lagrangians”. *J. Geom. Phys.* **35** (2000) 35–55.
- [34] A.M. REY, N. ROMÁN-ROY, M. SALGADO: “Günther’s formalism (k -symplectic formalism) in classical field theories: Skinner-Rusk approach and the evolution operator”. *J. Math. Phys.* **46**(5) (2005) 052901, 24 pp.

N. ROMÁN-ROY, *Some topics concerning the theory of singular systems* 13

- [35] N. ROMÁN-ROY: “Symplectic and non-symplectic realizations of groups for singular systems. An example”. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **30**(1)(1991) 89-95.